

pauperis action the court determines is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B); *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6th Cir. 2010). In order to survive dismissal, a complaint must set forth sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state claim to relief that is plausible on its face. *Hill*, 630 F.3d at 470-71 (holding that the dismissal standard articulated in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) and *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007) governs dismissals under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)).

The plaintiff's complaint must be dismissed because it does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting the plaintiff has any plausible federal civil claim against the defendants. *See Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ.*, 76 F.3d 716, 726 (6th Cir. 1996) (a complaint must "give the defendants 'fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests'").

Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted, but his action is dismissed in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B). The Court further certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 29, 2015

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE